

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR THE ORION PROJECT INTEGRATION CONTRACT (OPIC)
LYNDON B. JOHNSON SPACE CENTER**

On October 31, 2007, I met with the members of the Buying Team appointed to evaluate proposals for the JSC Orion Project Integration Contract (OPIC) Solicitation, NNJ07191172R. Several other officials of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center (JSC) also attended the meeting. OPIC is an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) Task Orders. The basic period of performance for this acquisition is 3-years from April 11, 2008 through April 10, 2011. There are two 1-year options. The Not-To-Exceed (NTE) amount for the basic effort is \$29 million, with each 1-year option providing a \$10 million addition to the basic NTE value. This acquisition is a partial follow-on contract to T-502X under GSA contract GS-23F-0107J for Professional Engineering Services. The acquisition is a small business set-aside. The scope of OPIC effort falls within the following categories: 1) Project Planning & Control support; 2) Technical support; and 3) Advanced Planning support.

Background

On July 25, 2007, Request for Proposal ("RFP") NNJ07191172R was issued. The RFP specified that the due date for the Past Performance volume, Model Contract Information, and Cognizant Audit Office Template (CAOT) information was August 27, 2007 by 3 p.m. local time, followed by submission of the remainder of the proposal due on September 10, 2007 by 3 p.m. local time.

On August 27, 2007, the JSC Contracting Officer received the Past Performance volume, Model Contract Information and CAOT information from the following firms:

ARES Corporation (ARES)
Barrios Technology, Ltd. (Barrios)

On August 29, 2007, the JSC Contracting Officer received the Past Performance volume, Model Contract Information, and CAOT information from Ellis & Ellis Associates, Inc. (Ellis & Ellis). It was determined that Ellis & Ellis' proposal did not meet the RFP requirements because the firm had failed to submit its Past Performance proposal, Model Contract information, and CAOT in accordance with RFP provision L.18, Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies and Due Dates. Therefore, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation 15.208(b) the proposal was determined "late" and could not be considered for award. All other proposals were submitted in accordance with the RFP requirements and, therefore, considered for award.

On September 10, 2007, in accordance with the RFP, the JSC Contracting Officer received the remainder of the proposal from the following firms:

ARES
Barrios

The Buying Team reviewed each remaining proposal to ensure compliance with the RFP requirements regarding submission. Both remaining proposals were submitted in accordance with the RFP requirements and, therefore, considered for award.

RFP Section M, Evaluation Factors For Award, Provision M.2 Combination of Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable and Trade-Off of Other Non-Cost Related Factors and Cost or Price stated that:

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of technically acceptable baseline requirements and a tradeoff of predefined qualitative characteristics; past performance; and cost/price.

Technical Acceptability was evaluated and rated on a Meets/Does Not Meet basis. The Technical Acceptability review was comprised of the following:

- Technical Approach Overview
- Proposal Scenario 1 (Project Planning & Control)
- Proposal Scenario 2 (Test & Verification)
- Proposal Scenario 3 (Vehicle Integration Office)
- OPIC Management Plan (DRD OPIC-PM-01)
- Phase-In Plan (DRD OPIC-PM-03)
- Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan (DRD OPIC-PR-03)
- Safety & Health Requirements/Safety and Health Plan (DRD OPIC-SA-01)
- Key Personnel
- Total Compensation Plan
- SBA Ostensible Subcontractor Rule Information

Predefined Qualitative Characteristics (QCs) were evaluated and rated using the following scale: Significant Value Added, Minimum Value Added, or No Value Added. The following Predefined QCs were applicable to the solicitation:

- (QC-1) Demonstrated examples of technical excellence proposed to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios
- (QC-2) Demonstrated examples of progressive, inventive management, process improvements, and technology enhancements proposed to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios
- (QC-3) Ability to hire and retain a superior workforce
- (QC-4) Certifications or other unique qualifications of personnel that are beneficial to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios
- (QC-5) An excellent phase-in that is comprehensive, effective and cost efficient

Past Performance was evaluated and rated using the following scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor.

A cost/price analysis of each offeror's proposed cost was conducted and a probable cost was developed for selection that included the basic period and all options.

RFP Section M: Evaluation Factors For Award provided:

Technical acceptability, past performance and the predefined qualitative value characteristics, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. Both technical acceptability and the predefined qualitative characteristics are more important than past performance and cost/price. Past performance is more important than cost/price.

In accordance with the above stated provision, the Buying Team evaluated each proposal on the basis of Technical Acceptability, Past Performance, Predefined Qualitative Characteristics and Cost/Price. A detailed description of the team's findings and my analysis and conclusions follows.

Technical Acceptability Evaluation

The Buying Team evaluated each offeror's proposal for overall technical acceptability in accordance with the RFP requirements. The Buying Team rated both offerors' proposals as "meets requirements" rating for Technical Acceptability. After reviewing the Buying Team's evaluation and discussing the merits of each offeror's proposal, I agreed that both offerors' proposals demonstrated technically acceptable approaches to meeting the Government's requirements.

Past Performance Evaluation

In accordance with the RFP, the Buying Team evaluated each offeror's past performance data. Offerors were required to submit a narrative description of a minimum of three (maximum of five) past contracts. Offerors were to consider both the type of work performed and magnitude of the effort(s) as they relate specifically to instant RFP requirements and submit past performance questionnaires, completed by the offeror's customers, from previous or current contracts. The Buying Team reviewed all past performance narratives and questionnaires, as well as information independently obtained from the NASA Past Performance Database and determined that each offeror had "Excellent" past performance. After discussing each offeror's relevant past performance with the Buying Team, I agreed that both offerors possessed the relevant past performance to successfully perform OPIC and merited ratings of "Excellent".

Predefined Qualitative Characteristics (QCs)

QC-1 Demonstrated examples of technical excellence proposed to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios

The Buying Team rated both offerors as providing "Significant Value" for this Qualitative Characteristic. After reviewing the Buying Team's findings and discussing the merits of each offeror's approach to this Qualitative Characteristic, I agreed with the Team's assessment that each offeror provided an excellent technical approach, of roughly equal merit, to completing the RFP requirements.

QC-2 Demonstrated examples of progressive, inventive management, process improvements, and technology enhancements proposed to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios

The Buying Team found that both offerors provided "Minimal Value" for this Qualitative Characteristic. After reviewing the Team's findings and discussing the merits of each offeror's proposal, I agreed that each proposal offered the Government innovative management and process improvements that provided value and would result in risk reduction, schedule efficiencies, improved communications, and increased customer satisfaction. I found each offeror's approach of roughly equal merit for this Qualitative Characteristic.

QC-3 Ability to hire and retain a superior workforce

I initially noted that Barrios received a rating of "Significant Value Added" while ARES received a rating of "Minimal Value Added" for this Qualitative Characteristic. The Team found, and I agreed, that both proposals provided acceptable total compensation packages with comparable wages and fringe benefits. However, I agreed with the Team's findings that Barrios' proposal contained several features that added significant value to its approach. I found these differences to be significant over the base period of the OPIC contract. For example, the Barrios approach contained numerous unique incentives designed to attract, retain and train a highly skilled work force. I found these features to be of significant value because it will help to focus employees and reward them for excellent performance on the contract.

In total, I found these incentives and approaches to hiring, training, and retaining a superior work force a significant discriminator in making my selection decision. The civil servant and contractor workforce assigned to the Orion Project must be comprised of the highest caliber professionals available if the agency's exploration mission is to be successful. I consider the Barrios' proposed approach an excellent plan for ensuring that such individuals will, in fact, be attracted and retained for the duration of the OPIC.

QC-4 Certifications or other unique qualifications of personnel that are beneficial to accomplish the statement of work and proposal scenarios

The Buying Team rated both offerors as providing "Significant Value" for this Qualitative Characteristic. After reviewing the Buying Team's findings and discussing the merits of each offeror's approach to this Qualitative Characteristic, I agreed with the Team's assessment that each offeror proposed an approach of roughly equal merit in

proposing a group of personnel with excellent qualifications and the ability to complete the RFP requirements.

QC-5 An excellent phase-in that is comprehensive, effective and cost efficient

I initially noted that Barrios received a rating of “Significant Value Added” while ARES received a rating of “Minimal Value Added” for this Qualitative Characteristic. The Team found, and I agreed, that both offerors proposed well thought out valuable phase-in plans. However, I agreed with the Buying Team’s assessment that the Barrios proposal offered the most value. The Barrios proposal provided an extremely thorough and comprehensive plan that was ideally tailored to the OPIC requirements. Moreover, the Barrios plan provided for a cost sharing of arrangement for phase costs with the Government. The Barrios proposal also offered lower management overhead based on their teaming arrangement. The combination of cost sharing and lower management overhead provides the government with an extremely cost efficient phase-in plan. In total, I found the Barrios proposal, which included the above described unique attributes, represented the most significant value to the Government regarding contract phase-in. The significant value added was a key discriminator in making my selection decision.

Cost/Price

The RFP required each offeror to complete an Excel Pricing Model, RFP Attachment L-3, using Standard Labor Categories and a Government provided labor resources profile.

After a cost/price analysis was performed on each offeror’s proposed cost, it was determined that no significant adjustments were necessary. In other words, the Buying Team determined, and I agreed, that the proposed cost was, for all practical purposes, equivalent to the probable cost for both proposals. After reviewing the Buying Team’s analysis and independently evaluating the offerors’ total probable costs, I agreed that Barrios offered the lowest price to the Government.

Selection Decision

In making my decision, I first noted that I agreed with the Buying Team’s analysis which indicated that both evaluated proposals’ Technical Acceptability met the requirements of the Government’s RFP. Also, each company demonstrated Excellent past performance for work of similar size and scope. However, the Barrios proposal provided Significant Value for Qualitative Characteristic 3 while the ARES Proposal offered only minimal value. I found the difference in value to be a key discriminator in my selection decision because of the critical nature of the work to be performed by the OPIC contractor and, therefore, the importance of hiring, training, and retaining a superior workforce. I also found the differences in value offered by each proposal under Qualitative Characteristic 5 significant in making my selection decision. The Barrios proposal offered a more robust, tailored, and cost-efficient approach to performing successful contract phase-in. Finally, I noted that the Barrios total probable cost was lower than ARES total probable cost.

Therefore, in accordance with the RFP that states the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation utilizing a combination of technically acceptable baseline requirements and a tradeoff of predefined qualitative characteristics, past performance, and cost/price, I find that Barrios Technology, Ltd. is the best value and select it to perform the Orion Project Integration Contract.



Debra L. Johnson
Source Selection Authority

11/13/07
Date